



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/487,387	01/18/2000	Leonard H. Lopez, Jr.	1036.1124	3104

7590

04/07/2006

Charles W. Hanor P.C.
P.O. Box 91319
San Antonio, TX 78209

EXAMINER

ZURITA, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/487,387

Applicant(s)

LOPEZ, JR., LEONARD H.

Examiner

James H. Zurita

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12 and 16-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-12 and 16-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Prosecution History

On 18 January 2000, applicant filed the instant application; there are no claims to priority. This application is related to application 09/825734, filed on 4 April 2001 which is a continuation in part of application 09/487392, filed 18 January 2000.

On 18 June 2002, the Examiner issued a first non-final office action, rejecting claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevcik (6,330,542).

On 11 February 2003, the Examiner issued a second non-final office action, rejecting claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevcik (6,330,542).

On 10 June 2003, applicant amended and traversed rejection.

On 10 September 2003, the Examiner issued a final office action, rejecting claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevcik (6,330,542).

On 10 December 2003, applicant filed a first request for continuing examination.

On 24 March 2004, a non-final action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (5,956,737) in view of Arledge (US 6,535,294).

On 22 July 2004, applicant amended claims and traversed rejection.

On 20 October 2004, the Examiner issued a final Office Action, rejecting claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laverty et al. (US 6791707) in view of ImageX.com SEC filing of 12 May 1999.

On 20 April 2005, applicant filed a second request for continuing examination and submitted an affidavit under 37 CFR 1.131.

On 18 July 2005, the Office mailed a non-final rejection of claims 1-24.

On 18 January 2006, applicant filed an amendment.

The present Office Action is a response to applicant's amendment.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's submission of 18 January 2006 has been entered.

Applicant amended claims 1, 3, 7-12 and 17-22 and cancelled claims 5, 13-15.

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 16-24 are pending. Claims 1 and 21 are independent.

Response to Arguments

Rejections under 35 USC 101 are withdrawn in view of *Ex Parte Lundgren*.

Objections to the drawings are withdrawn in view of amendment.

The Affidavits filed on 20 April 2005 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but are ineffective to overcome the 12 May 1999 date of the SEC filing.

On page 10, line 14-page 11, line 9, Applicant argues,

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the prior art and the present invention in several respects. First, Examiner repeatedly refers to Page 5 of the SEC filing in finding prior disclosure of an interface which prevents a user from altering company-indicative information. However, in the Examiner's own words, the prior art limits the user's ability to change the **typography** of the stationery product. This does not encompass the limitation in Claim 5 of the present application. Claim 5 allows the user to change some of the *company-indicative information*. Company-indicative information is the **content** to be printed; typography is the **way in which the content is printed**. [emphasis added]

The Examiner notes applicant's mention of company-indicative information:

Art Unit: 3625

... company **indicative** information, such as local office address and authorized personnel title, will be collected and stored in a database management system. Once entered and stored, at least some of this type of information forms the predeterminable profile, enabling the remote user is to simply select the desired company tailored business card or stationery product without necessity for error-prone repetitive data entry.

... Likewise, one or more fields may be dedicated for company-**indicative**- information such as, for example, **the address of a particular local office or the list of authorized, standard titles for various personnel.**

SEC Filing discloses that business customers can bring consistency to printed business materials and a uniform look (i.e. typography and content) throughout their worldwide organization. See, for example, page 45, BRAND CONTROL, copied here for applicant's convenience:

Customers can preset certain rules to bring consistency to their printed business materials and a uniform look throughout their worldwide organization. Logo treatments are protected across all printed products within the customer's digital catalog.

On page 11, lines 1-6, Applicant argues:

The SEC filing seems to teach away from such end user control of any company-indicative information by discussing the ability to make and enforce global changes from a centralized management point of view; the Applicant's invention clearly allows the flexibility *[sic]* to be defined differently for each client company. Therefore, Applicant asserts that by the Examiner's interpretation of the prior art, Claim 5 is not disclosed and hence not obvious.

In response to these comments, the Examiner notes that each company is able to determine uniform look (i.e., typography and content) according to present rules and predeterminable profiles.

On page 11, lines 6-9, Applicant argues:

...The limitation of Claim 5 will be incorporated into Claim 1 to overcome the rejection. Applicant also submits that this amendment renders Examiner's rejections of claims dependent on Claim 1 ineffective. In addition, since this limitation is already incorporated into Claim 21, it and its dependent claims should also be allowed.

In response, please see new rejection of claims 1 and 21, above.

Art Unit: 3625

On page 11, lines 10-21, Applicant argues,

In addition, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's Official Notice regarding server-side scripting used to reject Claim 14 and regarding server-side scripting implementing a logon security protocol used to reject Claim 15. It is necessary to adequately define the art to which the currently claimed invention belongs. One skilled in the art of printing would not have known server-side scripting such as Active Server Pages or HTML programming or scripting on the internet. As the art developed, the need for such knowledge also developed. Hence, the online print request services developed. But, at the time of invention, such knowledge was not within the scope of information one skilled in the relevant art would know. Applicant asserts that the Examiner is applying hindsight to conclude that the concepts in Claim 14 and 15 were within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the printing [sic] arts at the time [sic] of the invention

In response, the Examiner notes that arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze, 346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965); In re Geisler, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("An assertion of what seems to follow from common experience is just attorney argument and not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a prima facie case of obviousness."). See MPEP § 716.01(c) for examples of attorney statements which are not evidence and which must be supported by an appropriate affidavit or declaration.

Secondly, while applicant now appears to limit his invention to printing arts, the Examiner respectfully notes:

For many computer-related inventions, it is not unusual for the claimed invention to involve more than one field of technology. For such inventions, the disclosure must satisfy the enablement standard for each aspect of the invention. See In re Naquin, 398 F.2d 863, 866, 158 USPQ 317, 319 (CCPA 1968) ("When an invention, in its different aspects, involves distinct arts, that specification is adequate which enables the adepts of each art, those who have the best chance of being enabled, to carry out the aspect proper to their specialty."); Ex parte Zechnall, 194 USPQ 461, 461 (Bd. App. 1973) ("appellants' disclosure must be held sufficient if it would enable a person skilled in the electronic computer art, in cooperation with a person skilled in the fuel injection art, to make and use appellants' invention"). As such, the disclosure must teach a person skilled in each art how to make and use the relevant aspect of the invention without undue experimentation. MPEP 2106, page 2100-21, left column, Rev. 3, August 2005.

A “traverse” is a denial of an opposing party’s allegations of fact.¹ The Examiner respectfully submits that applicants’ arguments and comments do not appear to traverse what Examiner regards as knowledge that would have been generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Even if one were to interpret applicants’ arguments and comments as constituting a traverse, applicants’ arguments and comments do not appear to constitute an adequate traverse because applicant has not specifically pointed out the supposed errors in the examiner’s action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. 27 CFR 1.104(d)(2), MPEP 707.07(a). An adequate traverse must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying Examiner’s notice of what is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 728, 169 USPQ 231, 234 (CCPA1971).

The Examiner respectfully submits that the use of server-side scripting and security protocols is applicable to client-server applications, including the printing arts. See, for example, Ofer LaOr, CGI Programming with Visual Basic 5, Mc-Graw-Hill, 1998, at least pages 191, 202-209, from Chapter 7, Advanced HTML and Additional Server Side Constructs/***Server-Side***.

On page 11, lines 17-21, Applicant argues,

Applicant asserts that the Examiner is applying hindsight to conclude that the concepts in Claim 14 and 15 were within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the printing *[sic]* arts at the time *[sic]* of the invention. Applicant has incorporate the limitations of Claims 14 and 15 into Claim 1 and into Claim 21.

¹ Definition of Traverse, Black’s Law Dictionary, “In common law pleading, a traverse signifies a denial.”

Initially, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

On page 11, line 22-page 12, line 7, Applicant argues,

Applicant also respectfully takes issue with the Examiner's over-reliance on the SEC filing. An SEC filing is intended to be a document to guide an investor in his decision whether to purchase the security of a particular company. In this respect, it differs significantly from a technical publication. Much of what is disclosed in an SEC filing discusses the future business plans of the organization, rather than the current capabilities of the corporation. As such, a prior art reference's expansive predictions about its own significance should not always be taken at face value. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, the disclosures encompassed in the SEC filing should not be taken at their face value as being a patentability-defeating disclosure as intended by the Patent statutes.

While it is unclear what is meant by "...takes issue with...over-reliance on the SEC filing...", the Examiner respectfully notes that the Federal Courts do not appear to agree with applicant's opinion concerning the relationship between (a) disclosures in SEC Filings and (b) Patent statutes. *American Stock Exchange LLC. v. Mopex, Inc.*, 240 F. Supp. 2d 323; 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1458 (SEC filings are printed publications for purposes of 35 USC § 102). Please note that the Court relied on SEC filings to invalidate an issued patent and its presumption of validity.

On page 12, lines 7-12, Applicant argues,

...Applicant would assert that the SEC filing does nothing to put the inventive concept within the grasp of the general public; it does not enable the full extent of the concepts it purports to disclose. Furthermore, the true extent of what ImageXcom actually believes to be its inventive concept (or that of its assignor inventors) is encompassed in the Lavery reference, which Applicant firmly believes has been antedated by his prior submitted affidavits.

The Examiner respectfully submits that Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation and attorney opinion that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Claim Objections

Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 21 should be changed from "The automated print order system..." to "An automated print order system..."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-4, 6-12 and 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SEC filing of 12 May 1999 by ImageX.com, downloaded from the Internet on 15 October 2004, in view of Ofer LaOr, CGI Programming with Visual Basic 5, Mc-Graw-Hill, 1998, at least pages 191, 202-209, from Chapter 7, Advanced HTML and Additional Server Side Constructs/**Server-Side**.

As per claim 1, SEC Filing discloses an automated print order system (*Online Printing Center*, page 18) for institutional business cards and stationery products (e.g.,

marketing brochures, stationery and business cards, page 4). SEC Filing discloses that the system comprises:

a company-tailored prototypical product record comprising a template (i.e., a record, as defined by applicant, page 9, lines 21-25) that defines the placement and typography of a plurality of information elements for printing on a company-tailored business earner-stationery product. See at least discussion of prototypes of customer's printed business materials and rules for Consistency of materials, as on page 42. See also page 5, which discloses that with custom present rules, business can let offices place their own orders, while controlling which areas on a printed piece (i.e., typography) can and cannot be modified. See also page 45, section entitled ONLINE DATABASE OF COMPANY INFORMATION, which discloses that data is automatically incorporated into the text of promotional marketing materials, office stationery and business cards. The stored types of data are available as templates and records.

one or more predeterminable profiles defining user-indicative and company-indicative content for one or more of the informational elements provided by the template. See, for example, at least references to customer-specific and employee-specific data stored in various databases, page 45, *Online Database of Company Information* (applicant's profiles). The profiles are predeterminable in that profile data is provided prior to use.

an internet-accessible purchasing interface that allows a company representative to perform profile management functions, such as specifying and modifying the company-indicative content of said predetenninable profiles, and to perform order

Art Unit: 3625

processing functions, said order processing functions being comprised of generating a pre-press product automatically incorporating said predeterminable profile into said company-tailored business stationery product. See, for example, at least page 40, concerning customized customer interfaces customer web sites. The interface(s) permit customers, customer representatives, employees and other users to perform various functions, including:

- “profile management” functions, such as specifying and modifying the company-indicative content of said profiles. See page 4, “...ImageX.com ...solutions that enable businesses to modify, proof, procure and manage custom printed business materials over the Internet.” See, for example, at least page 45, which discloses that customers man make global changes to their online information or edit individual items that are stored in databases.
- “order processing” functions, comprising generating a prepress product automatically incorporating profiles into tailored product (s). See, for example, page 45, section entitled ONLINE DATABASE OF COMPANY INFORMATION, which discloses that data is automatically incorporated into the text of promotional marketing materials, office stationery and business cards, generating prepress products. The prepress products can then be routed directly to printing systems, as disclosed on pages 51-52, section entitled *DIRECT COST AND OVERHEAD COST REDUCTION*. See also Central management of orders, page 46. see also page 5, which discloses that print specifications are locked in for consistent quality.

SEC Filing's internet-accessible interface(s) permit users to perform additional functions, including:

- select one of the profile(s). See, for example, page 45, *ENHANCES CONTROL AND SCALABILITY*, which discloses that users such as employees may individually select and modify information in profiles. See also page 46, which shows that users can incorporate any new employee information into the databases and edit individual items.
- select and order a company-tailored business card or stationery product to be printed according to company-tailored prototypical product record and a selected [predeterminable] profile. See pages 45-46, which disclose that users can order broad range of printed materials.
- submit a print order for selected company-tailored business card or stationery product. See, for example, at least page 51, which discloses that the *Online Printing Center* permits users to submit orders into manufacturing systems.

wherein the requestor interface prevents the user from modifying the typography of any information to be printed on the company-tailored business stationery product. See, for example, at least page 5, which discloses that "...custom preset rules, business can let [users at] remote offices place their own orders, while controlling which areas on a printed piece [Ex. note: i.e., typography] **can and cannot** be modified.

As per claim 1, SEC Filing **does not** specifically disclose a server-side scripting implementation which incorporates a logon security protocol. This feature is disclosed by **Server-Side**.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine SEC Filing and **Server-Side** to disclose a server-side scripting implementation that incorporates a logon security protocol.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine SEC Filing and **Server-Side** to disclose a server-side scripting implementation that incorporates a logon security protocol for the obvious reason that CGI applications can use standard HTML constructs to do anything that a normal HTML page can.

As per claim 1, SEC Filing **does not** arrange the various functions and interfaces according to applicant's rearrangement and nomenclature (i.e., purchasing interface, requestor interface, processor interface, profile management functions, order processing functions.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to classify various functions according to various interface(s), such as processor interface, a purchaser interface and a requestor interface, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to classify various functions and interfaces and apply nomenclature accordingly for the obvious reason that it is important to design a system and assign functions according to who (which actors) will be performing particular functions and provide various interfaces to facilitate use of the computer.

As per claim 2, SEC Filing discloses that *prepress* product comprises a direct-to-plate command set. See, for example, at least page 42, concerning press-ready digital files sent directly to plate.

As per claim 3, SEC Filing discloses that an interface **allows** a user to select only those products for which company-tailored prototypical product records have been developed. SEC Filing disclose that users are restricted to selections available from a customized catalog, as disclosed on page 4.

As per claim 4, SEC Filing discloses user-indicative information includes the user's name and title. See, for example, at least references to Online Database of Company Information, page 45, that includes employee-specific data such as a name, position, title, etc.

As per claim 6, SEC Filing **does not** specifically disclose that a user's title is a pre-authorized title selected from a drop-down menu. **Official Notice** is taken that drop-down menus are old and well known and widely used on web site interfaces. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to disclose that a user's title is a pre-authorized title selected from a drop-down menu. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to disclose that a user's title is a pre-authorized title selected from a drop-down menu for the obvious reason that doing so permits a site to restrict a user's choices according to its own business rules.

As per claim 7, SEC Filing discloses selectively authorizing generation of a *prepress* product, comprising generating a *prepress* product automatically incorporating profiles into tailored product (s). See page 5, for power to manager and release orders. See also page 45, section entitled *ONLINE DATABASE OF COMPANY INFORMATION*, which discloses that data is automatically incorporated into the text of promotional marketing materials, office stationery and business cards, generating prepress products. Prepress products can then be routed directly to printing systems, as disclosed on pages 51-52, section entitled *DIRECT COST AND OVERHEAD COST REDUCTION*. See also Central management of orders, page 46.

As per claim 8, SEC Filing discloses modifying profile(s). See, for example, at least page 8, *OUR BUSINESS*.

As per claim 9, SEC Filing discloses modifying a user's print order. See, for example, at least page 5, concerning secure order authorization that provides the power to **manage** and release orders online.

As per claim 10, SEC Filing discloses that customers manage their data and print orders, page 4, including modifying such orders. SEC Filing **does not** use the word **delete**. SEC Filing discloses print errors in prior art, and reduced errors in the Online print order system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to include deleting a print order among the various managerial functions. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to include deleting a print order among the

various managerial functions for the obvious reason that ordering print products that are incorrect may be wasteful and annoying for both the online print center as well as the customer.

As per claim 11, SEC Filing discloses server site(s) for hosting said a customer's interfaces. See at least OUR BUSINESS, references to businesses having customized secure web sites, *Online Printing Center*, as in pages 8 and 18.

As per claim 12, SEC Filing discloses server sites resident upon and is accessible from any operable node on the World Wide Web. See, for example, at least page 4, and references to secure World Wide Web sites.

As per claim 16, SEC Filing discloses batch functions, including batch functions adapted to control generation of a *prepress* product. See, for example, at least references to batching, page 42. See, for example, at least page 5, concerning secure order authorization that provides the power to manage and release orders online; customers can batch their orders online.

As per claim 17, SEC Filing discloses storing a user's order. See, for example, page 5, which disclose that customers can modify, release, batch their orders online. See also references to order history and orders in production. This shows that customer orders are stored. SEC filing **does not** specifically disclose that the information is stored in a table, or that the table is labeled "order data table" or that the data contains elements to reference said a profile. SEC Filing **does not** specifically disclose that such data may be stored in tables, a data structure in a relational

database.² SEC Filing discloses the use of relational databases such as ORACLE relational databases that hold and manage all ordering rules, content information and process data, page 51. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to disclose the use of tables, and specifically, order tables. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to disclose the use of tables, and specifically, order tables for the obvious reason that Oracle relational databases and tables provide scalable solutions for enterprise data management.

As per claim 18, *SEC Filing* discloses that batch functions may be adapted to import information from a profile into files according to reference elements of an order profile, and that the file may then comprise a complete specification of a company-tailored business stationery product. See, for example, references to print-ready prepress products, page 9, press-ready digital files (page 42), print-ready digital files, (page 43, Streamlines Manufacturing), print-ready PostScript files (page 51, *Direct Cost and Overhead Cost Reduction*), press-ready digital files sent directly to Plate (page 114).

SEC Filing **does not** specifically disclose that such actions are carried out via batch **tables**. A table is a data structure in a relational database.³ SEC Filing discloses the use of relational databases such as ORACLE relational databases that hold and manage all ordering rules, content information and process data, page 51. Therefore, it

² Definition of *table*, MICROSOFT PRESS Computer Dictionary.

Art Unit: 3625

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to disclose the use of tables, and specifically, order tables. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine SEC Filing and general knowledge to disclose the use of tables, and specifically, order tables for the obvious reason that Oracle relational databases and tables provide scalable solutions for enterprise data management.

As per claim 19, SEC Filing discloses batch function(s) to format specifications for a tailored product into a *prepress* product. Where prepress products are produced, the specifications are prepress product compatible. This claim is rejected on the same grounds as claim 7.

As per claim 20, SEC Filing discloses that company-tailored product(s) may comprise business media selected from the group consisting of. letterhead; business card; envelopes; writing pads; address cards; and mailing labels. See at least page 4, concerning marketing brochures, stationery and business cards).

As per claim 21, SEC Filing discloses automated print order system for stationery products (*Online Printing Center*, page 18)

SEC Filing discloses a computerized representation of a set of printable stationery products. See at least page 45, concerning customized online catalog that displays an image of a product, section entitled *ONLINE CATALOG OF PRINTED BUSINESS MATERIALS*.

³ Definition of *table*, MICROSOFT PRESS Computer Dictionary.

SEC Filing discloses customized **templates** corresponding with each stationery product in the set, wherein the **template** defines a plurality of common and specific informational elements for printing on the stationery product wherein the **templatee** also defines the placement and **typographical** settings of the informational elements to be printed on the stationery product. A template is a record (specifications, page 9, lines 21-25). Records are data structures that format data. *SEC Filing* discloses **prototypes** of customer's printed business materials and rules for Consistency of materials, as on page 42. See also page 5, which discloses that with custom present rules, business can let offices place their own orders, while controlling which **areas on a printed piece** (i.e., typography) can and cannot be modified. See also page 45, section entitled *ONLINE DATABASE OF COMPANY INFORMATION*, which discloses that **data is automatically incorporated into the text** of promotional marketing materials, office stationery and business cards. The stored types of data are available as templates and records.

SEC Filing discloses predefined informational content for the common informational elements of the customized **templates** including for at least one of the common informational elements informational content that identifies a specific organization. See, for example, references to logos, page 45.

SEC Filing discloses **interface(s)** for entry of print order by a user associated with the specific organization. See rejection of claim 1.

- **allow** the user to select a stationery product from the set of printable stationery products. select and order a company-tailored business card or stationery product

to be printed according to company-tailored prototypical product record and a selected [predeterminable] profile. See pages 45-46, which disclose that users can order broad range of printed materials.

- **allow** the user to define (see references to new employee, page 43) or select a profile comprising informational content for the specific informational elements of the customized **templates** SEC Filing discloses that interface(s) can also prevent (i.e., not **allow**) a user from performing certain functions:

SEC Filing discloses **interface(s)** for fulfillment of the user's print order:

- generating a *prepress* product automatically incorporating profiles into tailored product (s). See, for example, page 45, section entitled *ONLINE DATABASE OF COMPANY INFORMATION*, which discloses that **data is automatically incorporated into the text** of promotional marketing materials, office stationery and business cards, generating prepress products. The prepress products can then be routed directly to printing systems, as disclosed on pages 51-52, section entitled *DIRECT COST AND OVERHEAD COST REDUCTION*. See also Central management of orders, page 46. see also page 5, which discloses that print specifications are locked in for consistent quality.
- informational content from the user-defined or user-selected profile including the user's name and title. See, for example, at least references to Online Database of Company Information, page 45, that includes employee-specific data such as a name, position, title, etc.

As per claim 21, the SEC Filing **does not** specifically disclose that the requestor interface prevents the user from modifying at least a portion of the company-indicative information of the selected predeterminable profile. SEC Filing discloses that customers [businesses] can present certain rules to bring consistency to their printed business materials and a uniform look (i.e., typography and content). See, for example, at least page 45, BRAND CONTROL:

Customers can preset certain rules to bring consistency to their printed business materials and a uniform look throughout their worldwide organization. Logo treatments are protected across all printed products within the customer's digital catalog.

Official Notice is taken that to present a uniform look (in typography and content, for example), a company's letterhead materials may include typography and company-indicative information, predeterminable in profiles, at least some of which a user is prevented from modifying.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the SEC Filing with knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose that a requestor interface prevents a user from modifying at least a portion of company-indicative information of a selected predeterminable profile.

- One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the SEC Filing with knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to disclose that a requestor interface prevents a user from modifying at least a portion of company-indicative information of a

selected predeterminable profile for the obvious reason that a uniform look permits a company to reduce errors and cost in the printing and procurement process.

As per claim 21, SEC Filing **does not** specifically disclose a server-side scripting implementation which incorporates a logon security protocol. This feature is disclosed by **Server-Side**.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine SEC Filing and **Server-Side** to disclose a server-side scripting implementation that incorporates a logon security protocol.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine SEC Filing and **Server-Side** to disclose a server-side scripting implementation that incorporates a logon security protocol for the obvious reason that CGI applications can use standard HTML constructs to do anything that a normal HTML page can.

As per claim 22, SEC Filing discloses **templates** are customized for a business organization. See, for example, references to customized print products, as on page 41. The elements may comprise a graphical representation of a business organization logo, page 42.

As per claim 23, SEC Filing discloses the user of common informational elements such as graphical representation of a business organization logo. See at least page 42, references to graphics and logos.

As per claim 24, SEC Filing discloses interface(s) adapted to process the user's print order by merging the defined or selected profile with the template of the selected

stationery product to automatically generate the *prepress* product. This claim is rejected on the sale grounds as claim 16.

As per claim 21, SEC Filing **does not** arrange the various functions and interfaces according to applicant's rearrangement and nomenclature (i.e., purchasing [sic] interface, requestor interface, processor interface, profile management functions, order processing functions.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to classify various functions according to various interface(s), such as processor interface, a purchaser interface and a requestor interface, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to classify various functions and interfaces and apply nomenclature accordingly for the obvious reason that it is important to design a system and assign functions according to who (which actors) will be performing particular functions and provide various interfaces to facilitate use of the computer.

Conclusion

An issue of public use or on sale activity has been raised in this application. In order for the examiner to properly consider patentability of the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), additional information regarding this issue is required as follows:

what activities took place, and when did those activities take place with respect to 18 January 1999, the critical date for 102(b) purposes.

The request is based on applicant's Affidavit of 20 April 2005 and statements concerning screen shots of 9 September 1999, 26 August 1999 and 10 June 1999. The various screen shots and dates indicate public use and on sale activity, as evidenced, for example, by invoicing and billed amount, money payments.

Applicant is reminded that failure to fully reply to this requirement for information will result in a holding of abandonment.

Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Screen printouts, Seybold Conference, Boston 1999, 6 pages. Downloaded from the Internet 25 October 2004. Eric Bean, The Business Printing Industry, presented on 1 March 1999 at the Seybold Conference, Boston/1999, downloaded from the Internet on 25 March 2005, 20 pages.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3625


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Zurita whose telephone number is 571-272-6766. The examiner can normally be reached on 8a-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Fadok can be reached on 571-272-6755. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12
James Zurita
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3625
31 March 2006


MARK FADOK
ACTING SPE 3625